

NO. 4:18-CV-50-FL


ORDER

On March 16, 2018, pro se plaintiff moved for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”). On March 21, 2018, plaintiff’s motion was deemed deficient and plaintiff was ordered to submit materials to bring his filings into compliance with the court’s local rules. Plaintiff filed response, but on April 30, 2018, plaintiff’s response was also deemed deficient and plaintiff was ordered to submit additional materials to bring his filings into compliance with the court’s local rules.

On May 3, 2018, plaintiff filed amended motion for leave to proceed IFP. On June 1, 2018, the magistrate judge entered M&R to which plaintiff filed no objections but instead filed amended complaint, (DE 11), stating he had “revised [his] complaint to reflect your Recommendations dated 6/1/18 and to make the details more clear and complete.” (DE 11-1 at 1).

Upon careful review of the M&R, plaintiff’s amended complaint, and of the record generally, having found no clear error, the court hereby ADOPTS the recommendation of the magistrate judge as its own, and, for the reasons stated therein, plaintiff’s amended IFP application (DE 7) is granted and the court will allow the first claim for breach of contract against defendant to move forward. The rest of plaintiff’s complaint is dismissed without prejudice. The clerk is DIRECTED to issue summons for defendant.

SO ORDERED, this the 1st day of November, 2018.



LOUISE W. FLANAGAN
United States District Judge